DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 606 IR 008 469

AUTHOR McGrew, Mary Lou
TITLE Survey of the Status of Materials Selection Policies in Iowa Public School Districts.
INSTITUTION Iowa Educational Media Association.
PUB DATE 5 May 79
NOTE 30p.: Small print in questionnaire may not reproduce well.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Board of Education Policy: *Educational Media: *Instructional Materials: Learning Resources Centers: *Media Selection: Policy Formation: *School Districts: School Libraries: School Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Iowa

ABSTRACT

This report describes a 1979 survey of 389 Iowa school districts which was conducted to determine the state of instructional materials selection policies in each district. Respondents, usually high school library media specialists, furnished data in three areas: (1) the current state of their district media selection policies, (2) selection policy elements present in officially adopted school board policies, and (3) selection policy elements present in unofficial selection policies. Respondents were also asked to indicate whether or not models and guidelines were used in their districts to develop either board-adopted or unofficial selection policies. The report contains a description of the survey methodology, an analysis of the data, tables, a summary, conclusions, and recommendations, as well as copies of the study proposal and the survey instrument. (FM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED188606

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SURVEY OF THE STATUS OF MATERIALS SELECTION POLICIES IN IOWA PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Presented to the Board of Directors,

Iowa Educational Media Association

By Mary Lou Mc Grew, Chairperson

Committee on Intellectual Freedom

May 5, 1979

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Jo Bruett

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR008469

4.8

CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	iii
Introduction and Background	1
Methodology of Survey	2
Analysis of Data	3
Question 1	3
Question 2	7
Question 3	9
Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations	15
Summary	15
Conclusions	16
Recommendations	18
Appendixes	
A. Proposal to IEMA Board	19
B. Survey Instrument	22

TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Question 1: Current Status of Selection Policies in Iowa Public School Districts	5
2.	Models and Guidelines Used by Local Districts to Develop Board-Adopted Policies	8
3.	Models and Guidelines Used by Local Districts in Unofficial Selection Policies	9
4.	Question 3: Selection Policy Elements Present in Officially Adopted School Board Policies	12
5.	Question 3: Selection Policy Elements Present in Unofficial Selection Policies	14

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

In October, 1975, the Iowa Department of Public Instruction published Selection of Instructional Materials: A Model Policy and Rules. This document is a culmination of the Department's long-term interest in the establishment of selection policies and procedures in local school districts. It provides for the first time to Iowa school districts a state model to consider for the development of their own selection policies and procedures documents.

Members of the Iowa Educational Media Association first considered the model presented in Selection of Instructional Materials in preliminary draft form at the Association's Fall, 1975, Conference. The IEMA Committee on Intellectual Freedom decided in the fall of 1976 to take a leadership role in supporting use of the Iowa model by Iowa school districts. The Committee designed a plan for recruiting and training a consultant in each of the state's fifteen Area Education Agencies. During the training session the consultants analyzed Selection of Instructional Materials to identify elements it has in common with other guidelines for selection policy development and for the features which make it unique among such guidelines. The role of the consultants in response to a request for their services was also a part of the training. Each member of the consultant group committed himself or herself to remain active from January, 1977, through May, 1978.

During the Summer, 1978, Planning Conference at Springbrook, the participants working on goals for the Committee on Intellectual Freedom considered the question of recruiting and training a new group of

consultants. No information existed about the status of selection policy development and adoption in Iowa schools to use in assessing the need for continuing the consultant service.

Using the input from the Summer Planning Conference, the Committee on Intellectual Freedom met in November, 1978, to finalize goals and develop a program of activities for the 1978-79 school year. A decision was made to propose to the IEMA Board of Directors that a survey of Iowa public school districts be conducted to determine the status of materials selection policies. A survey appeared to be necessary to guide development of future Association activities in this area of concern. The proposal (see Appendix A), which included a preliminary draft of a survey instrument and an estimated budget, was presented to the Board and approved by it on February 17, 1979.

METHODOLOGY OF SURVEY

A survey instrument and a list of recipients with addresses were needed to implement the survey. The preliminary draft of an instrument was developed by the chairperson of the Committee on Intellectual Freedom and submitted to the other two committee members for comment. Their suggestions were incorporated in a final draft of the instrument (see Appendix B). Questions intending to elicit information about the status of a selection policy in the local school district, the use of state and national guidelines for policy development, and elements included in an existing policy were devised.

An address file for one person in each of Iowa's 447 school districts was developed using the Iowa Educational Directory: 1978-79 School Year (Iowa DPI, 1978) and the "Mailing Address of Librarians,

1977-78" (Iowa DPI, 1978). Whenever possible, the high school library media specialist was identified as the recipient of the survey instrument. In school districts with more than one high school, the library media specialist in the first building on the list was usually selected.

Survey instruments were mailed to 447 schools on February 23, 1979, with a requested return date of March 15, 1979. A total of 343 instruments were returned in response to the first mailing. A follow-up request was mailed on March 23, 1979, to 120 schools who appeared not to have responded. An additional 46 responses were received after that date for a total of 389 or an 87.02 percent return.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Identifying school district numbers were recorded on each instrument before the mailing. All but fourteen respondents chose to leave the numbers on their instruments, making it possible to analyze the return in terms of school district size. A total group of 447 schools was divided into six nearly equal groups as follows:

Group	Enrollment Size	Number
1	to 340	75
2	341- 486	76
3	487- 680	75
4	681- 925	76
5	926-1700	74
6	1700-up	71

Question 1

Question 1 attempted to determine the current status of selection policies with regard to official school board adoption. Respondents were asked to check one of the following possibilities:

a. officially adopted as school board policy in_____ (give year)

b. considered and approved by school board but not adopted as official policy.

c. has administrative approval but board has not acted.

d. has been developed by library media specialist(s) and/or other faculty but has no official status.

e. none exists.

f. other; please explain _____

Responses to Question 1 are presented in Table 1.

The highest number of respondents checked either a or e. A total of 160 (41.13 percent) indicated the presence of an officially adopted school board policy. Another 124 (31.88 percent) said no policy exists in their districts. The remaining 105 respondents (26.99 percent) scattered their responses among b, c, d, and f or returned blank instruments. The largest group among these, 52 or 13.37 percent of the total, checked category d.

An opportunity to explain the response f. other was provided by the instrument. The variety of explanations offered by the eighteen respondents who checked category f can be summarized as follows:

1. A policy is being revised or written but has not yet reached the stage in the process of being presented to the school board for adoption. (7 responses)

2. No written policy exists, and the library media specialist implements procedures on the basis of personal judgment. (6 responses)

3. A policy was thought to exist, but no record could be found of school board consideration. (3 responses)

Table 1

Question 1: Current Status of Selection Policies
In Iowa Public School Districts

	Number possible	Number responding		Number and percentage of respondents indicating														Total b-f, blank	
				a		b		c		d		e		f		blank			
		#	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Group 1 to 340	75	61	81.33	6	9.84	4	6.56	2	3.28	9	14.75	37	60.66	2	3.28	1	1.64	55	90.16
Group 2 341-486	76	59	77.63	16	27.12	1	1.69	3	5.08	6	10.17	29	49.15	3	5.08	1	1.69	43	72.88
Group 3 487-680	75	61	81.33	20	32.79	2	3.28	2	3.28	11	18.03	20	32.79	5	8.20	1	1.64	41	67.21
Group 4 681-925	76	64	84.21	26	40.63	2	3.13	3	4.69	11	17.19	19	29.69	3	4.69	0	0.00	38	59.38
Group 5 926-1699	74	65	87.84	39	60.00	3	4.62	4	6.15	9	13.85	8	12.31	2	3.08	0	0.00	26	40.00
Group 6 1700-up	71	65	91.55	50	76.92	3	4.62	2	3.08	4	6.15	2	3.08	3	4.62	1	1.54	15	23.08
Anonymous		14		3	21.43	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	14.29	9	64.29	0	0.00	0	0.00	11	78.57
Total	447	389	87.02	160	41.13	15	3.86	16	4.11	52	13.37	124	31.88	18	4.63	4	1.03	229	58.87

4. Complaints about materials are discussed, but there is no process for dealing with a complaint. (2 responses)

5. A policy has been accepted by the school board but disregarded in practice. (1 response)

A statistical test was applied to determine if school district size appeared to make a significant difference in the presence or absence of an adopted school board selection materials policy. The chi-square statistic was computed for comparison of responses a and e and for comparison of responses a and the sum of responses b through f. In both instances at five degrees of freedom chi-square is significant at the .001 level. Reasons why school district size may be significant will be suggested in the summary and conclusions.

Question 1 asked those with an official school board policy to indicate the year of adoption. Not everyone supplied a year, but those who did indicated a range from 1965 to 1979. These responses are summarized as follows:

Year	Number	Year	Number
1965	1	1973	13
1966	0	1974	11
1967	0	1975	19
1968	4	1976	15
1969	6	1977	30
1970	9	1978	18
1971	3	1979	3
1972	9		

The years 1965-67 may be omitted from consideration since there was practically no policy adoption activity reported for those three years. During the six-year period from 1968 through 1973, a total of 44 policies were reported as being adopted. In contrast, in the five-year, four month period from 1974 through April, 1979, there were 96 reported adoptions. The appearance of the Iowa model in 1975 may have

contributed to the apparent increase in development and adoption activities in more recent years. For example, the largest number of adoptions reported in a single year was thirty in 1977. To consider further the influence of the Iowa model, the year of its appearance, 1975, may be omitted from consideration. In the seven years prior to 1975, 56 policies or an average of eight per year were reported as being adopted. In the three years four months since 1975, 66 or an average of twenty policies per year were reported as being adopted. Other implications of the appearance of the Iowa model will be discussed in relation to Questions 2 and 3.

Question 2

Question 2 (see Appendix B) asked if any existing policy had been developed or revised after consideration of Selection of Instructional Materials: A Model Policy and Rules. Some respondents did not check either yes or no. Question 2 also asked if the American Association of School Librarians Policies and Procedures and the National Council of Teachers of English Right to Read guidelines had been used in policy development. Responses of those indicating a. officially adopted school board policy in Question 1 are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Models and Guidelines Used by Local Districts
To Develop Board-Adopted Policies

	Iowa Model		AASL	NCTE
	Used	Not Used		
Group 1	2	2	2	2
Group 2	8	7	3	2
Group 3	10	8	5	4
Group 4	12	12	8	5
Group 5	21	12	15	11
Group 6	26	19	24	20
Total	79	60	57	44

Respondents may have checked none, one, two, or three of the documents cited in Question 2, so the numbers should be interpreted with caution. Of the 160 persons checking a for Question 1, 49.38 percent (79) reported consideration of the Iowa model while 37.50 percent (60) reported not using it. A total of 21 in this group did not answer that portion of Question 2. Since the maximum number of school districts which could have considered the Iowa model to develop their adopted policies following its publication in 1975 is 85, it appears to have been widely used. Table 3, which summarizes responses to Question 2 for those answering b, c, or do to Question 1, shows a similar result in the reported use of the three documents cited.

Table 3

Models and Guidelines Used by Local Districts
in Unofficial Selection Policies

	Iowa Model		AASL	NCTE
	Used	Not Used		
Group 1	9	6	2	1
Group 2	6	4	3	4
Group 3	4	11	5	3
Group 4	6	9	10	8
Group 5	14	4	7	4
Group 6	4	7	3	5
Total	43	41	30	25

Question 2 also offered respondents an opportunity to check an other category with an explanation of that response. The most commonly identified resource used in addition to the three documents previously cited was a selection policy from another school district. The range of responses to the other category are summarized as follows:

1. use of another school district's policy (17 responses)
2. professional books and articles (4 responses)
3. college courses (3 responses)
4. School Library Bill of Rights (3 responses)
5. workshop (1 response)
6. federal guidelines (1 response)
7. Department of Audiovisual Instruction (1 response)

Question 3

Question 3 asked respondents to identify the elements incorporated in their selection policies. These elements are:

a. covers all instructional materials (textbooks, other classroom items, print and audiovisual media)

b. covers library media materials only

c. lists criteria for selection of materials

d. identifies procedures for selection

e. delegates major responsibility for selection to: (we recognize that the board of directors has ultimate responsibility)

_____ 1) media specialist(s) _____ 3) principal(s)

_____ 2) teachers _____ 4) superintendent

f. includes provision for reevaluation and withdrawal

g. includes provision for acceptance and rejection of gifts

h. describes an objection procedure

i. provides for informal resolution of an objection by discussion among parties involved

j. includes form on which objector may request consideration of item for withdrawal

k. provides for a committee to be appointed to consider each individual objection

l. provides for a committee which meets regularly to consider objections

m. includes lay persons as members of the reconsideration or objection committee

Table 4 summarizes the responses of those indicating a. officially adopted school board policy for Question 1. A total of ten of the sixteen elements are present in over half of the 160 adopted policies. Substantially more than half indicated the presence of six of these ten elements as follows:

Element	N	%
c. criteria list	131	81.88
e 1. media specialist responsibility	138	86.25
f. reevaluation and withdrawal	118	73.75
h. objection procedure	141	88.13
j. consideration form	138	86.25
k. ad hoc consideration committee	118	73.75

These elements have traditionally been found in guidelines before the appearance of the Iowa model, and with the exception of k, the ad hoc consideration committee, all are specifically provided for in the Iowa model. In place of the ad hoc committee the Iowa model provides for a standing committee which meets on a regularly scheduled basis to consider objections. A total of 24 (15 percent) of the adopted policies follow the Iowa model in this respect. Two other elements, i. informal resolution, and m. inclusion of lay persons as members of the reconsideration committee, may also be considered unique to the Iowa model. These two elements are not included or are given minimal emphasis in other sets of guidelines. The informal resolution of an objection is included in 82 (51.25 percent) of the adopted policies in the present study. The inclusion of lay members is incorporated in 79 (49.38 percent).

Element e concerned the delegation of responsibility for materials selection to school district personnel while recognizing the ultimate responsibility of the school board. Respondents could check one, two, three or four of the four possible responses since this delegation of authority could be a shared resporsibility. School library media specialists are the most frequently identified persons

Table 4

Question 3: Selection Policy Elements Present
In Officially Adopted School Board Policies

	A	B	C	D	E 1	E2	E3	E4	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
Group 1 to 340	3	2	6	5	3	0	0	1	2	3	5	1	4	1	1	1
Group 2 341-486	7	9	11	8	15	2	1	1	12	11	14	9	14	11	2	4
Group 3 487-680	8	12	16	13	18	6	1	0	17	15	19	9	16	15	3	11
Group 4 681-925	11	14	23	19	23	7	3	3	15	12	22	11	22	20	5	14
Group 5 926-1699	22	17	32	24	35	8	3	3	30	18	35	25	35	30	5	19
Group 6 1700-up	31	17	42	30	42	11	9	3	41	35	45	26	45	40	8	28
Anonymous	2	1	1	1	2	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	2
Total	84	72	131	100	138	36	17	11	118	95	141	82	138	118	24	79

to whom selection responsibilities are delegated (136 or 86.25 percent) by adopted policies.

Table 5 examines the elements appearing in the 83 policies which do not presently have the status of official adoption. Responses which indicated b, c, or d to Question 1 are summarized there. Eight of the ten elements found in over half the adopted policies are also found in over half the nonadopted policies. The nonadopted policies show less of a tendency (36 or 43.37 percent) to incorporate the informal resolution process. They are also more likely (55 or 66.27 percent) to cover library materials only (element b) rather than all instructional materials (element a).

An attempt was also made to correlate use of the Iowa model with presence of elements i, l, and m which may be unique to the Iowa model with these results:

Element	Use of Iowa model	
	Yes	No
i. informal resolution	44	11
l. standing committee	13	4
m. lay members	45	6

It should be noted in evaluating the no responses that some school districts' personnel may have developed their policies using another district's policy as their primary model. These borrowed policies may have been based on the Iowa model and may account for the presence of the three elements in policies which appear not to have used the Iowa model.

Table 5

Question 3: Selection Policy Elements Present
In Unofficial Selection Policies

	A	B	C	D	E1	E2	E3	E4	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
Group 1 to 340	4	10	5	3	13	2	1	0	8	9	10	4	10	5	0	2
Group 2 341-486	4	6	7	6	10	5	0	1	7	8	8	5	8	7	2	4
Group 3 487-680	3	10	9	7	12	3	2	1	10	8	11	6	11	3	0	2
Group 4 681-925	7	11	12	10	16	4	1	0	10	13	14	7	13	9	2	4
Group 5 926-1699	8	12	17	11	19	3	0	0	18	13	19	11	18	14	1	8
Group 6 1700-up	4	4	8	7	8	0	1	0	7	6	8	3	6	4	1	3
Anonymous	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Total	30	55	60	45	79	17	5	2	61	57	71	36	67	42	6	23

Included in the survey instrument was a request for respondents to send a copy of their adopted policies to the chairperson of the Committee on Intellectual Freedom. A total of 93 policies were sent in response to this request. Each one has been analyzed to identify the elements incorporated in it. The policies have been placed on file in the Department of Library Science at the University of Northern Iowa. They will be available to anyone interested in them in the future by contacting the Department.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The Committee on Intellectual Freedom of the Iowa Educational Media Association surveyed the 447 Iowa school districts to determine the status of selection policies early in 1979. An 87.02 percent response rate was achieved by an initial mailing and a follow-up. School board adopted policies were reported in 41.13 percent of the 389 responding school districts. An additional 26.99 percent reported policies in stages of development and presentation or existing without official status. A total of 31.88 percent reported that no policy exists in their school districts.

Selection of Instructional Materials: A Model Policy and Rules (Iowa DPI, 1975) appeared to have been considered widely in developing those policies adopted following its publication. The guidelines of the American Association of School Librarians and the National Council of Teachers of English were also used as resources for policy development.

Over 85 percent of the adopted selection policies were found to include three elements which are usually recommended by various sets of guidelines. These are delegation of selection responsibility to the media specialist, a process for dealing with objections, and an objection form which must be filled out by the complainant before an objection is formally processed. A total of 93 officially adopted selection policies were sent in response to a request included in the survey instrument.

Conclusions

It appears that the Iowa model gave impetus to the development and adoption of instructional materials selection policies in Iowa following its publication. In 1977, the second year after its publication, thirty school districts developed and adopted policies. In the years preceding its appearance an average of eight policies per year were adopted while the years following its appearance show an average of twenty adoptions per year.

An examination of the 93 adopted policies sent to the Committee on Intellectual Freedom chairperson shows a number of passages lifted verbatim or with slight modifications to fit local needs from the Iowa model. Of interest also as a suggested impact of the Iowa model is the frequent appearance of an informal resolution process and the participation of lay members on the reevaluation committee. These two elements have not traditionally been found in older sets of guidelines.

School district enrollment size appears to be a significant factor in the existence and adoption of selection policies. In the two smaller sized groups with enrollments to 486, 18.33 percent of the respondents reported adopted policies. In contrast, 55 percent reported that no

policy exists. In the two larger size groups with enrollments of 926 or above, 68.46 percent of the respondents reported adopted policies while 7.69 percent reported that no policy exists. A statistical test, chi-square, showed a significant difference related to size at the .001 level of significance.

While no reasons for the effect of size were sought by the survey, it is possible to hypothesize some reasons. In the smaller school districts there may be a single school library media specialist. This person may be functioning with K-12 responsibilities or may be assigned on a part-time basis to the library media center. He or she has no support group of professional colleagues with like training and interests. Interest in policy development on the part of faculty may be discouraged by administrators. Small school district boards of directors may in general have a preference for not formalizing policy in any area, preferring to function from memory and decisions reflected in the minutes in handling current matters.

While the late 1970's have produced considerable movement toward development and adoption of selection policies, there is substantial room for improving the status quo. Over 58 percent of Iowa school districts in the study do not have adopted policies. Of concern is the status in those 58 school districts who did not respond by returning the instrument. Of concern also are those districts who have not updated and expanded their adopted policies by considering the concepts and substance of the Iowa model.

Recommendations

The Iowa Educational Media Association and its Committee on Intellectual Freedom should continue to be concerned with the status of selection policies in Iowa school districts. Selection of Instructional Materials: A Model Policy and Rules should be publicized through the publications of the Association and its professional conferences. Members of the Committee on Intellectual Freedom should be available for consultation to local school districts or should identify people in various areas of the state who have used the Iowa model who may serve as consultants.

Results of this study should be widely disseminated among school library media specialists, administrator organizations, and school board associations. The impetus of the 1970's should be maintained in pressing for policy development and adoption. A program should be developed to offer support and encouragement to those school library media specialists who are functioning as the sole professional in small school districts.

Portions of this study should be replicated at some future date when Association programming has had time to effect change. Since records of responses have been maintained, selected portions of the population may be identified as targets for future surveys. An effort should be made to determine why size is so significant a factor in policy adoption. The preference for an ad hoc reconsideration committee as opposed to the standing committee recommended by the Iowa model should be investigated.

Appendix A

TO: IEMA Board Members

FROM: Mary Lou Mc Grew, Chairperson
Committee on Intellectual Freedom

RE: Proposal for survey to determine status of instructional materials selection policies in Iowa school districts

DATE: January 13, 1979

For a number of years a primary goal of the Committee on Intellectual Freedom has been to encourage and support the development and school board adoption of instructional materials selection policies. We are proposing to measure progress toward that goal and the current status of selection policies in Iowa schools by conducting a survey using the attached questionnaire. The questionnaire will be mailed to one person in each school district. A mailing list has been prepared from BEDS. A preliminary report will be made to the Board at the March 29 meeting with a final report to the Board in May, and a report to the membership in the May/June Media Message.

Estimated cost of survey:

Printing (450 questionnaires)	$ 5.00
Envelopes (860 with one for enclosure)	7.00
Stamps (860 with one on enclosure envelope)	139.00
Postcards (200 for follow-up)	20.00
	$171.00

SCHOOL DISTRICT NUMBER _____

The Committee on Intellectual Freedom of the Iowa Educational Media Association is conducting a status study on selection policies in Iowa school districts. You are the only person in your school district from whom this information is being sought. We will appreciate your filling out the questionnaire below and returning it in the enclosed envelope by March 15, 1979.

The Committee would like to know which responses have been received to make a follow-up effort most economically, but if you prefer to respond anonymously, cut off the identification number at the top. Individual districts will not be identified in summarizing the data.

Thank you for participating,

Mary Lou Mc Graw
Committee Chairperson

1. Check the phrase which most closely describes the current status of a selection policy in your district.

_____ a. officially adopted as school board policy in _____ (give year)
_____ b. considered and approved by school board but not adopted as official policy.
_____ c. has administrative approval but board has not acted.
_____ d. has been developed by library media specialist(s) and/or other faculty but has no official status.
_____ e. none exists.
_____ f. other; please explain _____

IF YOUR ANSWER TO NUMBER 1 ABOVE WAS "e", STOP HERE AND RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE. IF NOT, PLEASE GO ON.

2. _____ Yes _____ No Has your policy been developed or revised after consideration of the model provided by the Department of Public Instruction publication Selection of Instructional Materials: A Model Policy and Rules (1975)?

If other models were used in addition to or in lieu of the DPI model, please indicate:

___ ALA/AASL Policies and Procedures ___ NCTE Right to Read ___ Other
Please specify_____

3. Check any items below which are incorporated in your selection policy.

_____ a. covers all instructional materials (textbooks, other classroom items, print and audiovisual media)

_____ b. covers library media materials only

_____ c. lists criteria for selection of materials

_____ d. identifies procedures for selection

_____ e. delegates major responsibility for selection to: (we recognize that the board of directors has ultimate responsibility)

_____ 1) media specialist(s) _____ 3) Principal(s)
_____ 2) teachers _____ 4) superintendent

_____ f. includes provision for reevaluation and withdrawal

_____ g. includes provision for acceptance and rejection of gifts

_____ h. describes an objection procedure

_____ i. provides for informal resolution of an objection by discussion among parties involved

_____ j. includes form on which objector may request consideration of item for withdrawal

_____ k. provides for a committee to be appointed to consider each individual objection

_____ l. provides for a committee which meets regularly to consider objections

_____ m. includes lay persons as members of the reconsideration or objection committee

IF YOUR ANSWER TO NUMBER 1 ABOVE WAS "a", WE WILL APPRECIATE YOUR SENDING US A COPY OF THE POLICY SO WE CAN DEVELOP A RESOURCE FILE FOR FUTURE USE.

Appendix B

SCHOOL DISTRICT NUMBER _____

The Committee on Intellectual Freedom of the Iowa Educational Media Association is conducting a status study on selection policies in Iowa school districts. You are the only person in your school district from whom this information is being sought. We will appreciate your filling out the questionnaire below and returning it in the enclosed envelope by March 15, 1979.

The Committee would like to know which responses have been received to make a follow-up effort most economically, but if you prefer to respond anonymously, cut off the identification number at the top. Individual districts will not be identified in summarizing the data.

Thank you for participating,

Mary Lou Mc Grew
Committee Chairperson

1. Check the phrase which most closely describes the current status of a selection policy in your district.

_____ a. officially adopted as school board policy in _____ (give year)
_____ b. considered and approved by school board but not adopted as official policy.
_____ c. has administrative approval but board has not acted.
_____ d. has been developed by library media specialist(s) and/or other faculty but has no official status.
_____ e. none exists.
_____ f. other; please explain _____

IF YOUR ANSWER TO NUMBER 1 ABOVE WAS "e", STOP HERE AND RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE. IF NOT, PLEASE GO ON.

2. _____ Yes _____ No Has your policy been developed or revised after consideration of the model provided by the Department of Public Instruction publication Selection of Instructional Materials: A Model Policy and Rules (1975)?

If other models were used in addition to or in lieu of the DPI model, please indicate:

____ ALA/AASL Policies and Procedures ____ NCTE Right to Read ____ Other
Please specify_____

3. Check any items below which are incorporated in your selection policy.

_____ a. covers all instructional materials (textbooks, other classroom items, print and audiovisual media)

_____ b. covers library media materials only

_____ c. lists criteria for selection of materials

_____ d. identifies procedures for selection

_____ e. delegates major responsibility for selection to: (we recognize that the board of directors has ultimate responsibility)

_____ 1) media specialist(s)
_____ 2) teachers
_____ 3) Principal(s)
_____ 4) superintendent

_____ f. includes provision for reevaluation and withdrawal

_____ g. includes provision for acceptance and rejection of gifts

_____ h. describes an objection procedure

_____ i. provides for informal resolution of an objection by discussion among parties involved

_____ j. includes form on which objector may request consideration of item for withdrawal

_____ k. provides for a committee to be appointed to consider each individual objection

_____ l. provides for a committee which meets regularly to consider objections

_____ m. includes lay persons as members of the reconsideration or objection committee

IF YOUR ANSWER TO NUMBER 1 ABOVE WAS "a", WE WILL APPRECIATE YOUR SENDING US A COPY OF THE POLICY SO WE CAN DEVELOP A RESOURCE FILE FOR FUTURE USE.